

1 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of the State of California
2 DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General
3 JULIE L. GARLAND
Senior Assistant Attorney General
4 JENNIFER A. NEILL
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
5 AMANDA J. MURRAY, State Bar No. 223829
Deputy Attorney General
6 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
7 Telephone: (415) 703-5741
Fax: (415) 703-5843
8 Email: Amanda.Murray@doj.ca.gov

9 Attorneys for Respondent

10
11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 **DAVID QUESADA,**

15 Petitioner,

16 v.

17 **ARTHUR KNOWLES, Acting Warden,**

18 Respondent.

USDC-ND 08-2869 JF

**RESPONDENT'S REQUEST FOR STAY
PENDING ISSUANCE OF THE
MANDATE IN *HAYWARD* OR, IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, REQUEST FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME;
[PROPOSED] ORDERS**

19 Judge:

The Honorable
Jeremy Fogel

20
21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, contending that his due process rights
23 were violated by the Governor's 2006 decision finding him unsuitable for parole. The Court
24 ordered a response to the Petition. On May 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted en banc review in
25 *Hayward v. Marshall*, 527 F.3d 797 (9th Cir. 2008). Oral argument was heard on June 24, 2008.
26 The en banc court in *Hayward* may decide whether this Court has jurisdiction over this case, and
27 the appropriate standard to be applied if there is jurisdiction. Therefore, Respondent requests a
28 stay of this case pending the issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.

Req. for Stay

Quesada v. Knowles
USDC-ND 08-2869 JF

ARGUMENT

I.

THE COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION AND STAY THIS MATTER PENDING ISSUANCE OF THE MANDATE IN *HAYWARD* BECAUSE BOTH THE BALANCE OF THE INTERESTS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF JUDICIAL ORDER AND ECONOMY FAVOR GRANTING A STAY.

A trial court has discretion to ensure the just and efficient determination of a case by staying it pending the resolution of other proceedings where a stay would be “efficient for [the court’s] docket and the fairest course for the parties.” *Leyva v. Certified Grocers of Cal.*, 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In determining whether to grant a stay, a court should consider the possible damage that may result, the hardship or inequity that a party may suffer, and the orderly course of justice, in terms of simplifying or complicating the issues, proof, and questions of law, that could result from the issuance of a stay. *Lockyer v. Mirant Corp.*, 398 F.3d 1098, 1109, 1111 (9th Cir. 2005). A court should also take into account the existence of similar cases that are pending in the same district court, and the probability that more are likely to be filed. *Id.* Staying cases that are on the forefront of an issue provides a necessary delay, allowing for resolution of the issues and resulting in uniform treatment of like suits. *Id.*

As the resolution of *Hayward* could significantly impact this case and numerous similar cases and issuing a stay would prevent unfairness and serve the interests of judicial economy, the Court should exercise its discretion and stay this matter pending the issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.

A. Moving Forward with This Case Before the Finality of *Hayward* Does Not Serve the Interest of Judicial Economy.

Granting a stay in this case serves the interests of judicial order and economy. On May 16, 2008, the Ninth Circuit granted rehearing en banc in *Hayward*. (Ex. 1.) At issue before the en banc panel in *Hayward* are two threshold issues which are necessary to the resolution of this case: 1) whether California has created a federally protected liberty interest in parole for life inmates, and 2) if a liberty interest is created, what process is due under clearly established Supreme Court authority. Resolution of these issues could establish that Petitioner does not have

1 a federally protected liberty interest in parole, potentially allowing the Court to dismiss his
 2 claims for lack of jurisdiction without requiring briefing from the parties. Moreover, it would be
 3 wasteful to proceed in this case without the Ninth Circuit's holdings in these matters, as the
 4 parties would need to brief issues that will be decided en banc and then submit supplemental
 5 briefing to apply the law as clarified in the en banc decision. The two rounds of pleadings may
 6 unnecessarily complicate the matters raised and would impair the orderly course of justice.
 7 Waiting for the resolution of *Hayward* would thus conserve Court resources, and prevent the
 8 Court from having to revisit this matter if *Hayward* is modified or reversed.

9 A stay would also serve judicial order and economy by maintaining uniform treatment of
 10 like suits, as once the law is settled it can be uniformly applied. In many habeas petitions
 11 challenging California parole decisions, the Ninth Circuit has sua sponte stayed submission of
 12 the cases until the resolution of *Hayward*. See, e.g., *Tolliver v. Carey*, no. 07-15347; *Boatman v.*
 13 *Brown*, no. 05-16199; *Smiley v. Hernandez*, no. 06-55727; *Valdivia v. Brown*, no. 08-15650;
 14 *Johnson v. Newland*, no. 04-16712; *Varner v. Brown*, no. 05-16029; *Johnson v. Finn*, no. 06-
 15 17042; *Clark v. Shepherd*, no. 06-55065; *Cooke v. Solis*, no. 06-15444.

16 Granting a stay would therefore conserve judicial resources and serve the Court's interest
 17 in orderly managing these proceedings.

18 **B. A Stay Would Not Unfairly Delay Petitioner in Pursuing His Claims.**

19 A stay of this case at the district level would not unfairly impose any additional or
 20 otherwise avoidable hardship on Petitioner. As discussed above, if the parties proceed in this
 21 case additional briefing will likely be needed after the decision in *Hayward*, perhaps delaying
 22 final resolution. Also, even if this court decides this case before *Hayward*, it is likely the losing
 23 party will file an appeal, and that appeal may be delayed pending resolution of *Hayward*. (See
 24 Arg. I.A.)

25 **CONCLUSION**

26 When the equities are balanced, the parties' interests and the interests of judicial economy
 27 support staying this case pending the final resolution of *Hayward*. Staying this case until
 28 challenges to *Hayward* are resolved and that decision becomes final promotes the orderly

1 resolution of this matter, and will assist in maintaining uniformity of like suits pending before
2 this Court and similar cases that will be filed in the future. Respondent therefore requests that
3 the Court exercise its discretion to stay this matter pending issuance of the mandate in *Hayward*.
4 In the alternative and if this request is denied, Respondent respectfully seeks a thirty day
5 extension of time from the date the Court's denial is served on the Attorney General's Office to
6 file the Answer.

7 Dated: July 30, 2008

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Attorney General of the State of California

10 DANE R. GILLETTE
Chief Assistant Attorney General

11 JULIE L. GARLAND
Senior Assistant Attorney General

12 JENNIFER A. NEILL
13 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

14
15
16
17 AMANDA J. MURRAY
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Respondent

18
19
20 20122338.wpd
SF2008200129

EXHIBIT 1

FILED

FOR PUBLICATION

MAY 16 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RONALD HAYWARD,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JOHN MARSHALL, California Men's
Colony East,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 06-55392

D.C. No. CV-05-07239-GAF(CT)

ORDER

KOZINSKI, Chief Judge:

Upon the vote of a majority of nonrecused active judges, it is ordered that this case be reheard en banc pursuant to Circuit Rule 35-3. The three-judge panel opinion shall not be cited as precedent by or to any court of the Ninth Circuit.